Present: Marc Wallman, VPIT; Rian Nostrum, TFAC Chair; Mari Borr, Anne Denton, Viet Doan, Asha Dubasi, Preston Gilderhus, Jim Hammond, Tanya Kramer, John Pollock, Michael Russell, Lauren Singelman, Melissa Stotz, Matthew Warscocki (proxy for Jacob Dailey), David Wittrock, CeCe Rohwedder

Unable to attend: Jacob Dailey, Jessie Lee

1. Members were welcomed, and introductions were conducted.

2. **Student Technology Fee history, purpose and overview** provided by Rian. More in-depth discussion of action plan solicitations will take place at an upcoming meeting. The IT Division values the feedback from this advisory group on IT campus initiatives and priorities, particularly as they relate to the student perspective. Marc customarily does not attend TFAC meetings, and definitely not during discussion of action plans and associated processes.

3. **Marc discussed the Student Technology Fee budget.**
   A. A detailed budget for the IT Division – not just for the student technology fee - will be reviewed later this semester. Marc is currently studying overall budget projections for the division.
   B. In 2013, the division started receiving year-end funds from NDSU’s administration, used to instrument classrooms and other learning spaces; ongoing support and refresh of this equipment is creating additional pressure on the IT budget.
   C. Classroom technologies, computer labs and Blackboard receive the majority of student technology fee revenue; some IT Division salaries are also funded by this fee, and funds are set aside for infrastructure, usually for the network - there is a separate fund for wireless. We now have too many devices on our network, so appropriate adjustments are necessary.
   D. Areas that have been traditionally funded by the student technology fee have grown substantially in recent years.
   E. Marc will be discussing funding for instrumentation in the STEM building with NDSU administration, as well as the IT Council, and he will also include budget discussion at the Dec. 7 Town Hall meeting, at which he is presenting on IT.
F. Marc welcomes questions from TFAC members as they arise.

4. **Possible request for an increase to Student Technology Fee.** The Student Fee Advisory Board receives all requests for fee increases and will begin meeting later this fall. A request for an increase to the student technology fee would first be discussed with TFAC. There have been no increases to this fee in the last two years.

5. **Action Plan solicitation for the 2015-2016 academic year:**
   A. Rian provided an overview of this program and process.
   B. Availability of $50,000 is anticipated; this will be confirmed at next month’s meeting at which time the budget will be discussed.
      a. In previous years, more funds were available, and the Bylaws still state that $300,000 should be available for action plans each academic year.
      b. A suggestion was made for the option to submit a pre-proposal the year prior to the actual proposal, so funds may be set aside.
      c. A suggestion was also made to solicit letters of intent, due about a month prior to the submission deadline. Given the small amount of money available, the additional work on the part of project directors would be too much; also, the letter of intent would not necessarily provide a comprehensive picture of the actual project.
      d. In the past, a lot of small but innovative projects were funded, some as pilots; at some point TFAC decided that the small-scale projects were not worth funding, so the emphasis was placed on large projects with impact on more students, and as a result, the funding of innovation considerably decreased.
      e. The IT Division’s budget had not increased for a period of 15 years, so its only source of additional income, necessary to keep up with campus technology use and demand, was the student technology fee.
      f. A suggestion was made to keep with one award cycle, in spring semester, for the entire $50,000 available and was agreed upon; the campus community will be notified early this semester, perhaps without referencing the amount available.
      g. It might be worth advocating to Marc – and/or the Provost - whether more than $50,000 may be available for action plan awards; if the Provost provided funds, they would be placed into the IT Division’s budget specifically for use for action plans.
      h. Any funds not awarded likely are returned to the IT budget.
   C. M to follow last year’s model for the timetable and process for action plan solicitation and awards, and to work out the specifics and language between meetings (Hammond/Warsocki).

   [David Wittrock left the meeting, at 1:50 p.m.]

   **Vote on the motion: MSC unanimously.** TFAC should present reasons why certain technologies should perhaps no longer be funded as they have been, thus making funds available for new and innovative technologies through Action Plan awards. An example is that virtualizing clusters and the software available to students there, would greatly lower the funding invested in clusters.

   [Michael Russell left the meeting, at 1:55 p.m.]

6. **Changes to Action Plans (on Blackboard):**
   A. None to report

7. **Action Plan reports:**
A. Status reports received since the last TFAC meeting (on Bb):
   a. #1502, Projection Equipment for Graduate Learning Center. Chris Martin, NDSU Libraries

B. Final reports received since the last TFAC meeting (on Bb):
   None to report

8. Adjournment: M to adjourn (Warsocki/Pollock). MSC unanimously.